

### Extension of Harijan Colony in Yerrakote Village in Chintamani Taluk.

Q.—552. Sri J. NARAYANAPPA (Mulabagal S. C.).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the date of starting of proceedings for acquisition of lands for extension of Harijan Colony in Yerrakote village in Murugamalla hobli, Chintamani Taluk ;

(b) the extent of land (in guntas) in respect of which acquisition proceedings have been recorded ;

(c) the reasons for failure to allot sites to Harijans residing in this village who are undergoing great hardship ?

A.—Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—

(a) 29th March 1954.

(b) 30 guntas.

(c) The land that was proposed to be acquired has since been found to be unsuitable for construction of houses. The question of acquiring that land has therefore been dropped. Steps are, however, being taken to acquire some other land as early as possible.

### ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

#### Explosion of Chandramadnala in Mysore City.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The consideration of notice of adjournment given by the Hon'ble Member Sri Y. Veerappa regarding the explosion at Sri Rangacharu Town Hall, Mysore, on the Independence Day was postponed yesterday in order to examine its admissibility because the question of *sub judice* had been raised. Since it is now reported that this matter is in court, I hold that the motion is not admissible and therefore it is disallowed.

As regards the other adjournment motions, they will be taken up at a suitable time.

### ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—

Sir, I rise to a point of order. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ Rules Committee Report ಅನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ Committee of Privilegesಗೆ ಏಳು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಮೊದಲು Privileges Committeeಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಹೌಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ನಾಮನೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಆ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. Rules Committee ರಿಪೋರ್ಟು ಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಇದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಲಾಯಿತು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಉಹಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕವಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೀತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಜಾಗೃತವಾಗಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಡ್ವಾಂಸ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬಹುದು. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸೇರ್ಪಡೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಂದ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ ಜನ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಗಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಜನರ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದ ಕಾರಣ ಈ motion ತಂದು ಈಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಥಾನ ನಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಈ motion ಅನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಿ ಮೊದಲು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು adopt ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಗೆ represent ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಅಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೊದಲು 100 ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದ್ದರು. ಈಗ 208 ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯು ಎರಡರಷ್ಟಾಗಬೇಕು. ಮೊದಲು ಇದ್ದದ್ದನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ (ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಯಾದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾದರೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದಾದಾಗರಲ್ಯಾ ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಡೀಲಿಮಿಟೇಷನ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಪಾಪ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದಂತೆಲ್ಲಾ ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವಾಗ ಆ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಅಸಮಂಜಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಸೆನೆಟ್ ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಿವಿಲಿಜಸ್ ಕೌಟಿ, ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಆಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ, ಎನ್ಟ್ರಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಏನು ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೋ, ಆ ರೀತಿ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಅಕ್ಟಿನ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 32ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕ್ಷಮತೆಗೊಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಪತ್ರ್ ಪುನಃ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡೋಣವೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೇ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಮೇಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೋ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಬಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ನಾನು ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಹೌಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಚಾಲ್ತಿ ಇರುವ ಹಳೆಯ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸದನದ ಸು ವೇಳೆಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದು ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಸರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟು ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರನ್ನು ಕನ್ಸಲ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಹೌಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಹೌಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಬಿತ್ತು. ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೌಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯೊಂದು ರಚಿತವಾಯಿತು. ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಹೇಗೆ ಬಂತು ಎಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಅಕ್ಟಿನ 32ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಆಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದುವು. ಅವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಸಾರ್ವಮಾಧವಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಈ ಹೌಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ ಮೇಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಯಾವಾಗ ಈ ರೂಲ್ ಮೇಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೋ ಆಗ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಈ ಸಲವೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಇಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ಜಾಗೃತೆಯಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದರ ಯಾವ ತಾಪತ್ರಯವೂ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಿಗೆ

ರೂಲ್ಸ್ನ್ನು ಫೋಮ್ ಮಾಡದೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯಲಿ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಸತ್ಯಂ ಪ್ರದಾಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೀ-ಆರ್ಗನೈಜೇಷನ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹೊಸ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯದೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸಗಳ ತನಕ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದು? ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ತನ್ನ ಹಾದಿಯನ್ನೇ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸದೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ತಲೆಬಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳು ಮೊಟಕು ಆಗದಂತೆ ತಾವು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

\*Sri G. SIVAPPA (Chitaldrug).—Sir, I rise to a point of order. In accordance with sub-rule (2) of Rule 171 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Assembly the Committee of Privileges shall consist of seven members of whom four shall be elected by the Assembly in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote and the rest nominated by the Speaker at his discretion. But by the notification that you have been pleased to issue the number of members to be elected is seven. May I know under what provisions of the Rules of Procedure the Speaker has been pleased to announce that seven members should be elected by this House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already said that I had taken action under section 32 of the States Reorganisation Act and the necessary notification is also published in the Gazette. For the information of the House I will read section 32 of the S.R. Act which deals with rules of procedure.

“Until rules are made under clause (1) of article 208 by the Legislative Assembly of a new State the rule of procedure and conduct of business in force immediately before the appointed day with respect to the Legislative Assembly of the corresponding State shall have effect in relation to the Legislative Assembly of the new State subject to such modifications and adaptations as may be made therein by the Speaker.”

(MR. SPEAKER)

In view of the fact that this Assembly has become a bigger one consisting of 209 members I have to take action because otherwise the Committee of Privileges would have consisted of only four elected members, three members being nominated by the Speaker. I did not want that such a thing should continue and that is why I have now decided that the Committee of Privileges should consist of seven members elected by this House.

\*Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Krishnarajasagar).—I should like to submit that even originally when the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House were adapted by the Speaker, the strength of this House was what it is today. It is true that under section 32 of the States Reorganisation Act which relates to rules of procedure, the Speaker can make such modifications and adaptations as he deems fit and such rules shall then be the rules of procedure for the conduct of the business of this House. Accordingly, you were pleased to modify and adapt certain rules of procedure and place them before the House as the rules of procedure as modified and adapted by you under section 32 of the S.R. Act. But section 32 of the S.R. Act does not empower the Speaker to make such modifications and adaptations as he deems fit from time to time. The Chair is empowered to make such modifications and adaptations as it deems fit once and that was done by you and the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business as modified and adapted by you were given to us and we are proceeding accordingly. According to those rules we are entitled to elect only four members, but you have been pleased to issue a further notification under section 32 of the S.R. Act providing for seven members to be elected. This is clearly an over-exercise of the power that has been conferred on the Speaker under section 32 of the S.R. Act. I would, therefore, request you to enlighten the House on the authority that has been derived by the Speaker from the S.R. Act. If it were the intention of the Act to give to the Speaker the power to

modify the rules as and when required, then it would have been worded differently and the wording would have been "the Speaker shall make such modifications and adaptations as he deems fit from time to time." If that interpretation is to be accepted, certain difficulties will arise and I would like to give an example. According to the rules of procedure for tabling amendments we are entitled to have three days time. Suppose a member waits for two days under the presumption that he has got three days' time to give notice of an amendment but in the meantime you issue a modification saying that the time allowed is only one day then the members will have to suffer from not being able to give notice of amendment to that motion. Therefore, the correct interpretation of Section 32 is that the Chair is entitled or authorised to make such adaptations and modifications only once and once alone. Once they have been made and placed before this House, the function of the Chair, so far as Section 32 is concerned, ceases, and the Chair becomes functus officio. That is the correct interpretation. I would like the Chair to enlighten us on this point.

\*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—I just wanted to submit the same point that when once the Chair after due deliberation made certain changes, the House acts on the presumption that these rules do apply. If changes are made from time to time, it will be very embarrassing. I would suggest that the Rule-making Committee proceedings may be expedited and after they are approved, the elections for these committees may take place. Having waited so long, it will be possible for us to wait a little longer. The Rule-making Committee may be requested to sit day to day and complete the deliberations.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The report is ready.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—When that is the case, why not take up the report and consider it? The House might view it differently and may suggest that the number of

members to the Privilege Committee may consist of 14 instead of 7. In that case, should we again elect another 7 members more? It would not be proper. Similar is the case with respect to Estimates Committee, or Public Accounts Committee. We are very much afraid that the powers taken for forming the House Committee may also be taken in the case of Public Accounts Committee or the Estimates Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Bheemappa Naik has stated that the power was being taken away by the Speaker to appoint Committees. That is not correct. I have already issued the rules that these committees should be elected and the allegation is not borne out by facts.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I have never made any allegation. We interpret and say that the Chair has the right to make amendments only once and not from time to time. We only submitted that when once an amendment is made and we are acting on the presumption that those rules are applicable, it would be very embarrassing for us if rules are changed from time to time. That is all I submitted. The word that is used is 'allegation.' I have never made allegations against the Chair. That is my opinion. That is all.

\*Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA (Chikodi).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, a question has arisen and as I feel the interpretation that is put on Section 32 by my learned friends Sri Channabasappa and Sri Bheemappa Naik is not correct, I am going to submit a correct interpretation according to me. It is conceded by my learned brothers that the Chair has a right to issue rules in modification and adaptation of the old rules that were in force here. Now, it is contended, Sir, that this power can be used only once. There is no justification for this interpretation. The only limitation that is put by Section 32 on the use of powers is contained in the words "until rules are made under clause (1) of article 208 by the Legislative Assembly of a new State." Until this time, the Chair has got every right to issue modifications and adaptations.

Now it is contended by my learned brothers that there were no words used in Section 32 to justify the use of powers under Section 32 more than once. If Parliament wanted to put any such restriction, such restriction should have been specifically stated in the Section. Even if it was intended by Parliament that power should be used once, the Section should have stated that power should be used only once. When the section is worded in general terms, it means, it gives power to the Speaker to issue modifications and alterations as many times as is found necessary by him. The only limitation placed on the wording is 'until rules are made under clause (1) of article 208.' Therefore, there is no force in the contention advanced by my learned brothers. Some other contention is made by my learned brother Sri Bheemappa Naik. He says that it becomes awkward. That is another matter. I think the Chair would take into consideration all the conditions that are likely to lead to any awkwardness. I for one do not find that there is any reason for that apprehension in the modifications and adaptations so far made. I quite agree with my learned brothers that the new rules should be adopted as early as possible.

Sri G. VENKTAI GOWDA (Palyam).—What Sri Kothavale said is not correct. In view of the reorganisation of the State, certain powers were given to the Speaker under Section 32 and the Speaker having exercised those powers, the adaptations and modifications made should stand till the new rules are made by the Rules Committee and adopted by this House. Supposing they are changed or modified in the middle, it will not only embarrass the House, but also embarrass the Speaker himself because he is reviewing his own order. So, that is not the correct position. That is why I submit that the rules may be adopted as soon as possible and whatever the Speaker did, should stand till this House adopts the Report of the Rules Committee.

\*Sri N. RACHIAH (Hunsur).—Mr. Speaker, now I am not here to dispute the right asserted by the Speaker. You



(SRI N. RACHIAH)

are aware that this House has been established under the Constitution, under Parliamentary democracy. In parliamentary democracy, Sir, as you are aware, the Speaker is to be elected on the first day after summoning of the House after general election. You are also aware that the Public Accounts Committee, Estimates Committee, the Privileges Committee and other sister committees should be constituted immediately thereafter and that should have been the primary and most important duty of the Government or the Speaker, Sir. At the same time, with regard to the States Reorganisation Act, it empowers the Speaker to make modifications in the rules till such time the Rules of Procedure as recommended by the Rules Committee are adopted. So long as the Rules of Procedure are not adopted by this House, the Speaker has got every right, I think, to exercise his right as many times as possible in the best interests of the business of the House. But the question is why the adoption of the Committee Report was not taken up at the first session or at the second session or at least in the third session in which we are called to transact the business. It is already in the fourth day we are, Sir, and at the same time, you exercised your right in appointing certain committees like House Committee. You may also appoint a few more committees if we postpone the adoption of the Report which was already on the agenda during the second session, that is, during the last session itself. If you at this rate postpone things, you can have any committee constituted under this Act for at least the remaining term of five years and thereby the House or the Speaker will not be establishing a perfect convention or transacting business in accordance with rules as adopted by the House. My learned friend was telling that Sri Bheemappa Naik or Sri Channabasappa was not correct. That is not the point here. You may exercise any

2-30 P.M.

number of times your right. It may not be questioned, but their contention

is not dispute the right of the Speaker, but it is actually putting a question to the Chair or the Leader of the House why this adoption of the Report was not taken into consideration in the best interests of the business of the House and on this point I want definite ruling from the Speaker and I hope you will appreciate my view point.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Under section 32 of the S.R. Act, there are two aspects. One is 'as modified' and what is more important 'as adapted', 'modified from time to time' may perhaps be interpreted in a proper way, but when in addition to 'modified' the word 'adapted' is there, you can only adapt once; you cannot keep on adapting any number of times. When the word 'adapted' comes in, I think it is closed once for all. Because even the new rules that are going to be placed before the House, it can be adapted once; you cannot go on adapting from time to time. You can modify from time to time, but you cannot modify and adapt from time to time. When the word 'adapted' is there, you can only adapt once; you cannot keep on adapting any number of times. Because even the new rules that are going to be placed before the House can be adapted once; you cannot go on adapting from time to time.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—The two words used in section 32 are "modifications" and "adaptations." As the learned gentleman who has spoken before me has stated, the section is capable of only one and one meaning. That is, the rules which prevail till then can be modified and followed by this Assembly till fresh rules are made. The passing of the fresh rules cannot be postponed *sine die* or till we find time as it is quite clear it is nearly six months since this House is constituted and the rules have been framed, though not passed and have been pending before this House for a considerable time. This rule is quite clear that the modification and adaptation can be made only once. Not only that; we have seen a number of new rules published in the Gazette. I do not know whether these new rules

can be brought into the four corners of these two words. It is high time that we postpone these things and pass the rules that have been pending before this House, and not rush through the elections. After all, we have waited for six months. There is no hurry and we can find enough time to pass these rules. These committees may be elected after passing the rules.

Mr. **SPEAKER**.—If it was the intention of the S. R. Act that the power of modifications and adaptations should be used only once, they ought to have made it clear by having those words in the Act. The words are 'subject to such modifications and adaptations as may be made therein by the Speaker.' The words are not 'subject to such modifications and adaptations as may be made only once by the Speaker.' It is not correct. Hon'ble Member Sri H. M. Channabasappa may think that my interpretation is wrong but anyhow my interpretation has to prevail in the House. In this respect I have also consulted eminent legal men and they have given specially the advice that the power subsists so long as the rules are not adopted under clause (1) of Article 208. Till that time I have that power.

I may also read something from the Central Act—the General Clauses X of 18.7. In section 14, it is said: "Whereby any Central Act or Regulation made after the commencement of this Act, any power is conferred, then, unless a different intention appears, that power may be exercised from time time as the occasion arises." So it makes my position clear that I have that power of making modifications and adaptations as many times as possible, but it is not my intention to make such modifications and adaptations as I like. As the occasion arose, I had to make modifications after having consulted the relevant authorities in this matter.

In so far as these committees are concerned, these committees do not take away the right of the House to elect the members. So the right of electing the members has not been taken away and the charge cannot be levelled against me that I have taken

away the right of the House. So I submit that the action that I have taken is not out of order or is such as contravenes the provisions of the Act.

There is another point. Hon'ble Members raised the point that I ought to have placed the Rule-making Committee Report before this House. The Report was not in fact ready when we sat for the first time after the House was reconstituted and it was ready when we sat for the second session, that is, the budget session. At that time, as all Hon'ble Members know, I tried to place it on the table of the House and I put certain days for discussion of the Report but it could not be taken up as there was no time and as some money Bills had to be passed by the Assembly in time. I have been always very anxious to put it on the agenda. Though we sit till the 5th of the next month, there is absolutely no time for us to adopt the Rule-making Committee Report; but if it is the intention of the House that it should be taken up and that we should sit longer, I have no objection; I do not want to take away the power of the House. The power of the House was to elect a smaller number of people and now my order relates to such a state of affairs where the House can elect a larger number of people, that is, larger number than the present rules allow. So I submit that the sentiments expressed by the Hon'ble Members are rather misplaced and have no foundation in fact. In fact I had waited for the adoption of the Report and did not put the election to these Committees on the agenda because I thought the Rule-making Committee Report would be adopted by this House. I think the matter is now clear. If they want elections, they can have; if they do not want, election can be postponed. This need not be according to the order I have placed. As I thought that the House should not be without these committees for long, I proposed them now. If it is the intention of the House to adopt the Rule-making Committee Report during this session, I have no objection and I do not stand in the way of Hon'ble Members. The charge of some Hon'ble Members

(MR. SPEAKER)

against the Speaker that he wants to usurp the powers of the members, is absolutely not correct. They must revise the attitude so far as my action in this connection is concerned.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—In respect of this matter you have even given a ruling. Is it suggested that the matter should be left to the House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are two matters; one is about the action that I have taken. On that, I have given a ruling that my action is in accordance with section 32 of the States Reorganisation Act and also the Central General Clauses Act. That is a matter which cannot be raised again. The other point is whether we should have the committees now or postpone the election. That is a matter which the House may decide for itself.

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಪಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನೂ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವು ಮುಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳು ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ ಮುಗಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಲು ಆಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ಮೂರು ದಿನಗಳ ರಜಾನಂತರ ಸೇರಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದ ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಥಮ ಸ್ಥಾನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—22, 23 ಮತ್ತು 24ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖುಗಳು, ಹೀಗೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ಮೂರು ದಿನಗಳು ರಜಾ ದಿನಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆ ರಜಾ ದಿನಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ನಂತರ 25 ಮತ್ತು 26ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು—ಈ ಎರಡು ದಿನಗಳನ್ನೂ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಖಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಎರಡು ದಿನಗಳನ್ನು ಖಾಸಗಿ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿಸ್ತರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅನಂತರ ತಾರೀಖು 27-28 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜರಿನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರೈವ್ ಕಾಂಪಿಟಿಷನ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರಲಿವೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಫೀಸ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ.

ಅದು ಖಾಸಾಗಲೇ ಬೇಕು. ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳೂ ಪೂರೈಸಿದ ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಮುಗಿದನಂತರ ಮುಂದಿನ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಆ ಚುನಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಸಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್ (ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಿಟಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ಆಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ. . . . .

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channanapattana).—On a point of order, Sir. The Hon'ble Member Sri Suryanarayana Rao is sitting here, there and everywhere. Has the Speaker permitted him to sit anywhere?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾವು ದಿನಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ನನಗೆ ಅನೇಕಾವರ್ತಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನೇ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆ ಕೂಡಲು ಪರವಾನಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕುಂದೂರು ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ (ಚನ್ನಗಿರಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನೊಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರುಯಾರು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ನೀತಿ ನೇಮಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ಒಂದು ಹದ್ದು ಬಿಸ್ತು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಂಥ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಶ್ರೀ ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾಯರು ನಾವು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತರೆ ನನಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದ್ದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಬಂದು ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನೇ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪರವಾನಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕುಂದೂರು ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ.—ನಿನ್ನೆಯಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವ 15 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ತಮಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಾಳೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೋ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಾಗೆ ಒಮ್ಮೆಲೆ 15 ಜನರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದು? ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ.

(Sri K. S. Suryanarayana Rao rose).

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—In view of the remarks offered, may I take it that . . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it right for any member to stand up and speak when another member is also standing?

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—I do not know between whom it applies; who stood up first?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He stood up first.

**Sri Y. VEERAPPA.**—That is all right then.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನ್ನ ಅರಿಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು: ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತಾವು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ 21ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನವರೆಗೂ ಅಜೆಂಡಾ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದಮೇಲೆ 21ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಾದ ನಂತರ ನಡೆಸಲಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ತಾವು ಮೊದಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ.

**Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA** (Chief Minister).—May I say a word, Sir? As the business now stands, it would be very difficult to take up this question of framing the rules till the first week of October. Even if we adopt the rules then, it would be difficult for us to have the elections; it may take some time. There is already some work for these committees to do. I submit that it is not my business—and you have stated that it is not your business—to see that rules are not adopted. Last time we tried to adopt them but it was not possible because of the pressure of business. If it is possible, we shall adopt them at the end of the session. But, for the purpose of elections, we cannot continue the House. In the meanwhile, we need not postpone the work which these committees will have to perform. I request the House to elect these committees now and immediately the new rules are adopted, we may go on with them.

**Sri K. KENCHAPPA.**—Frequently holding the elections will not be congenial with the business of the House. Therefore, I should like to impress that the Report of the Rules-making Committee must be adopted immediately in order to avoid a fresh election to the committees. It has been accepted by all the members here that the rules must be adopted before proceeding with the elections to these committees.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—If it is your intention that the official work should be postponed, this could be done; otherwise, this cannot be done. Very important official Bills are there and they must be given top priority. If you mean that we may sit next month, I have no objection.

**Sri K. KENCHAPPA.**—That is what I said. In the beginning itself I said that the session can be continued for two or three days more.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—After the 5th?

**Sri K. KENCHAPPA.**—Yes.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—That would not be possible because we have to go to the Presiding Officers' Conference. ಮುಂದಿನ ತಿಂಗಳು ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ನಂತರ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಿಜೈಡಿಂಗ್ ಅಫೀಸರ್ಸ್ ಕಾನ್ಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಹೋಗಲೇಬೇಕು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ನಾವು ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ನಂತರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಾದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ವೆಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ; ಆಗಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರು ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂರೂವರೆ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಭತ್ಯೆ ಬೇರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರೇಕೆ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲೇ ನಡೆಸಬಾರದು?

**Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.**—That would not be possible.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—That question has been considered and it has been found not feasible.

**Sri G. ANNA RAO** (Afzalpur).—I submit that I wish to disagree with the observation made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. If he does not give top priority to the Rules of Procedure, personally I feel that the committees which are going to be constituted under the present rules would be restricted and if the House feels that the number should be enlarged, then, again to elect some more members it would be difficult. Therefore, it is no use postponing this. We must give first priority to this and even we can postpone other Bills. This House ought to have taken the Rules of Procedure and given it top priority. Anyhow, we have already passed two or three months in this way. These are important committees of the House and the work also may be pending. Therefore instead of holding the elections now on a restricted scale, we must have them postponed for the present and take up the Rules Committee's report immediately and after passing the rules, hold elections.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not possible. It is not possible to adopt the rules in this session. So far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, the Accountant General is pressing me for the constitution and functioning of the Committee. The Privileges Committee must also function, for reasons best known to the House. Elections to the Mysore Senate and the Karnatak University Senate will have to take place. They are very important. If it is the intention of the members that all these things should be postponed, I do not know how the House can proceed. In fact, I do not understand the objections at all. The right of election is vested in the House and it is not being taken away.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—Objection ಬರುವುದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಈಗ ಸಮಿತಿ ಯನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿವಸದಲ್ಲೇ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರು, ಹೊಸ ಮೈಸೂರಿ ನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಭಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದ್ದ ಜನರನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದು ಆಗಿಯೇ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಭಯ ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ Accountant General ಅವರು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು he is pressing for it. ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸಿಟಿಂಗ್ ಈಗ ಆಗಲೇ ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಆಗಲೇ ಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿ, ಏನೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದೆಯೂ ಕೂಡ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಎಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ ನಾವು ಭಯ ಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇರುವುದು ಮೊದಲು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಅನಂತರ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಆಗುವ ಮಾತಲ್ಲ. ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ ಆಚೆಗೆ ಕೂಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ತಾನೆ 21ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನ ನಂತರ ಯಾವತ್ತಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲ ನಿಶ್ಚಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಈಗ ಐದನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ ಆಚೆಗೆ ಕಾಲ ನಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಏನು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡೋಣ.

Sri G. ANNA RAO—May I suggest an alternative, Sir. As far as the elections to the University Senates are concerned, we can take them now. But elections to the Privileges Estimates and Public Accounts Committees may be postponed because they will function after the month of October.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must correct one impression. Elections to the Estimates Committee may be postponed, but as far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, the Accountant General is after me.

Sri G. ANNA RAO—I do not think, Sir, there is any possibility of that Committee meeting now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is so much that has accumulated for the Committee. Moreover the Madras and Bombay Governments are also pressing for the formation of the Committee.

Sri G. ANNA RAO—So far as the Privileges Committee is concerned, I do not think the House has referred any case to it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes, there is.

Sri G. ANNA RAO.—That matter can wait and is not urgent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to you, I take it only elections to the Estimates Committee should be postponed.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May I know, if it is not possible to postpone some of the legislative business?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not possible and it is not fair to do so. There will be a lot of pressure. If you leave it to me, I will advise—I can only advise the House—that as far as possible these Committees may be formed now. After all, the House is not losing anything. The House would have the opportunity to elect the committees under the rules after they are adopted. Meanwhile the House should do substantial business.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶರಣಗೌಡ (ಜವಾರಗಿ).—ಈಗ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಅಲ್ಲ. That is my advice.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—May I know whether the Chair has given a ruling or whether it is in the nature of a directive?



Mr. SPEAKER.—You can call it an 'advice'. In this matter I cannot go against the wishes of the House because the whole thing arises on the wishes of the members. I can only advise that the House, as far as possible, proceed with the formation of the committees.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆದ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾಗ್ರತ್ ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಆಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಾದರೆ we have no objection. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ತಾವು ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡಿದ ತರಹದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕುಭಾದ್ಯತೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಂಠಿತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ರೆಜಿಷ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ್ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ ಪ್ರೋಸೀಜರ್ ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅದು ಒಂದು. ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಸಾನ್-ಅಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಬಿಸಿನೆಸ್ಗೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನೇನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಾದಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗ ರಚನೆಮಾಡಿ, ಮುಂದೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಅಡಾಪ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಮೇಲೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ.—ರಜದಲ್ಲ ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ಆಗುವಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

\*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪ ನಾಯಕ್.—ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರೆಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು unimportant ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ರೆಜಿಷ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ್ ವರಗಿಂತ unimportant ಎಂದರೆ ಅದೇಕೆ? ಮುಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡೋಣ, ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲಾದರೂ ಮಾಡೋಣ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಫೋರಜ್ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಆರು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ಗಂಟೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸಬಹುದು. ಆಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆಗಲಿ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ತಾವು, modifying powers ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು, from time to time if you go on modifying ಕೊನೆಗೆ ನಾಳೆದಿವಸ ಏನೇನು modification ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ?

The Chair has just said that he could modify the rules from time to time. The Speaker has interpreted the Act in such a manner as to indicate that the right of modifying the rules vested in him at any and every time. He can go on modifying anything and do anything. It is not a correct position, Sir. Therefore, the members would be satisfied even if legislative work is postponed so that we can be sure that

things are done according to our wish. That would be much better. I have no objection, even if the elections go on to these Committees. But to say that it is not possible in this session at all to consider the rules, is not proper. It is not correct, particularly because of the interpretation the Chair has given. Therefore I would not personally like postponing consideration of the rules.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಚರ್ಚೆ ಬೇಡ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಇದು ಎಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ I say that it should be ended here. ಈಗ ಕಮಿಟಿ ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಿ, ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡಿ. ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ To say that I go on modifying the rules, is not fair of the Hon'ble Member. It was just necessity that compelled me to modify the rules. I have modified the rules after great thought. I have already stated that in modifying the rules I had not taken away any of the rights of this House. That being so, there should be no allegation against me that I am using this source of authority 'like anything'. It is not fair to me, coming as it does especially from my close friend, Sri Bheemappa Naik. It is really hurting me very much.

3 P.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I do not know what allegation I made. I only said that you changed twice and the House Committee has been nominated much against the wishes of the House. It has a right of election.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not changed twice. That is a wrong allegation. Where was the occasion to change the rules twice? They were modified only once. I request him with all the humility at my command to bear with me and not to rake up this question once again.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I would like the Chair to withdraw the remark that I made allegations against him. I never meant any thing. I only suggested what I felt. The remark that I made allegations against the Chair makes me shiver.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—May I request my friend that it may stop? I think this matter has been sufficiently discussed.

(SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA)

I said that there were difficulties in taking up this matter immediately because there was important legislative work to be gone through. I am sure my friends will bear with me. We will have these committees elected now. During the next session, the first thing would be the formulation of these rules and adopting them. I hope the House will allow me to make these motions.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Sringeri).—May I know the difficulties in the way of taking up the rules and discussing them?

Mr. SPEAKER.—They have been explained.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I am not convinced.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If you are not already convinced it will be difficult either for me or to the Chief Minister to convince you.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I was about to say that we can adopt the rules and complete legislative work also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a matter of opinion. So far as I am concerned I have looked into them thoroughly.

Sri G. E. HOOVER (Chickpet).—I rise to a point of order, Sir. Is it correct for any member to get up when the Chair is on its legs?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nobody can stand up.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I think we have discussed the point sufficiently. I hope the House will allow me to move the motions.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—When decision is not given how can the Leader of the House move the motions?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have permitted him.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—But a decision on the point whether it is proper to press for the constitution of committees before the rules are framed and adopted has not been given.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Decision has been given on that point. This should go on.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—I should certainly say that the whole House, at any rate this part of the House, feels that the consideration of

the Mysore Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution and Water Rate) Bill may rather be postponed and the report of formation of the Rules Committee taken up immediately. No doubt one is as important as the other. But the less important may be postponed.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ 500 ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಇವೆಲ್ಲವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಐದು ದಿವಸಗಳಾದರೂ ಆಗಬಹುದು, ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. It may go up to five days.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಜನರು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಮುಗಿಸಿ, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ, ಏಕೆ ಅರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Is it a ruling of the Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes, it is a ruling.

Sri S. SARAN GOWDA (Jewargi).—If it is a ruling then the motion may be put to vote. Otherwise how can we know that the majority of the members of this House agree to the Hon'ble the Leader of the House making the motions?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Ruling has nothing to do with the majority opinion. Ruling is from the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಬಹುಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪನವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಕದವರೊಡನೆ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋದರು.)

### Committee of Privileges.

#### Motion to elect

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—Sir, I move:

“That this Assembly do proceed to elect seven members to the Committee of Privileges in accordance with sub-rule (2) of rule 171 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly as modified by the Speaker.”